arXiv:1610.06770v1 [math.AG] 21 Oct 2016

FANO SCHEMES FOR GENERIC SUMS OF PRODUCTS OF LINEAR FORMS

NATHAN ILTEN AND HENDRIK SÜSS

Abstract. We study the Fano scheme of k-planes contained in the hypersurface cut out by a generic sum of products of linear forms. In particular, we show that under certain hypotheses, linear subspaces of sufficiently high dimension must be contained in a coordinate hyperplane. We use our results on these Fano schemes to obtain a lower bound for the product rank of a linear form. This provides a new lower bound for the product ranks of the 6×6 Pfaffian and 4×4 permanent, as well as giving a new proof that the product and tensor ranks of the 3×3 determinant equal five. Based on our results, we formulate several conjectures.

1. Introduction

Given an embedded projective variety $X \subset \mathbb{P}^n$, its Fano scheme $\mathbf{F}_k(X)$ is the fine moduli space parametrizing projective k-planes contained in X. Such Fano schemes have been considered extensively for the case of sufficiently general hypersurfaces [AK77, BVdV79, Lan97] but less so for particular hypersurfaces [HMP98, Beh06, CI15]. In this article, we study the Fano schemes $\mathbf{F}_k(X)$ for the special family of irreducible hypersurfaces

$$X = X_{r,d} = V\left(\sum_{i=1}^{r}\prod_{j=1}^{d} x_{ij}\right) \subset \mathbb{P}^{rd-1}$$

for any $r > 1, d > 2$. We exclude the case $d = 2$ since this is a smooth quadric hypersurface with significantly different behaviour.

In [IT16, §3], Z. Teitler and the first author considered the Fano scheme $\mathbf{F}_5(X_{4,3})$. With the help of a computer-assisted calculation, they observed the curious fact that every 5-plane L of $X_{4,3}$ is either contained in a coordinate hyperplane, or there exist $1 \leq a < b \leq 4$ such that L is contained in $V(x_{a1}x_{a2}x_{a3} + x_{b1}x_{b2}x_{b3})$. This motivates the following definition:

Definition 1.1 (λ-splitting)**.** Consider $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$. A k-plane L contained in $X_{r,d}$ admits a λ-*splitting* if there exist $1 \leq a_1 < a_2 < \ldots < a_\lambda \leq r$ such that L is contained in

$$V\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\lambda}\prod_{j=1}^{d} x_{a_i j}\right) \subset \mathbb{P}^{rd-1}.$$

We say that $\mathbf{F}_k(X_{r,d})$ is m-split if every k-plane of $X_{r,d}$ admits a λ-splitting for some $\lambda \leq m$.

The above-mentioned observation from [IT16] can now be rephrased as the statement that $\mathbf{F}_5(X_{4,3})$ is two-split.

We make two conjectures regarding the splitting behaviour of these Fano schemes:

Conjecture 1.2 (One-Splitting)**.** *Assume $r \geq 2$ and $d \geq 3$. The Fano scheme $\mathbf{F}_k(X_{r,d})$ is one-split if and only if*

$$k \geq \begin{cases} \frac{r}{2} \cdot d & r \text{ even} \\ \frac{r-1}{2} \cdot d + 1 & r \text{ odd} \end{cases}.$$

Conjecture 1.3 (Two-Splitting)**.** *Assume r is even and $d \geq 3$. The Fano scheme $\mathbf{F}_k(X_{r,d})$ is two-split if*

$$k \geq \frac{r}{2} \cdot d - 1.$$

We show in Example 3.1 that the bound on k of Conjecture 1.2 is indeed necessary for one-splitting. However, the sufficiency of the conditions of Conjectures 1.2 and 1.3 for one- and two-splitting is less obvious.

Consider a degree $d > 1$ homogeneous equation of the form

$$\boldsymbol{\ell}_1 + \ldots + \boldsymbol{\ell}_m = \sum_{i=0}^{m} f_i \mathbf{x}_i \tag{1}$$

where the $\mathbf{x}_i$ are pairwise coprime squarefree monomials, the $\boldsymbol{\ell}_i$ are degree d products of linear forms, and the f_i are degree $d - \deg \mathbf{x}_i$ products of linear forms.

Definition 1.4 (Property C_m^d)**.** We say that C_m^d is true if, for any equation of the form (1) satisfying $\deg \mathbf{x}_i + \deg \mathbf{x}_j \geq d+2$ for all $i \neq j$, it follows that there is some i for which $f_i = 0$.

Our first main result relates the above definition to our two conjectures:

Theorem 1.5. *Fix $r \geq 2$, $d \geq 3$ such that either d is even, r is even and $d \geq r$, or r is odd and $r \leq 5$. Suppose that C_m^d is true for all*

$$m \leq \frac{r-1}{2}.$$

Then Conjectures 1.2 and 1.3 hold for this choice of (r, d).

Secondly, we use this to prove our conjectures in some special cases.

Theorem 1.6. *Property C_m^d is true if $m \leq 2$ or if $d \leq 4$. Furthermore, Conjectures 1.2 and 1.3 hold if $r \leq 6$ or if $d = 4$.*

Our analysis of Equation (1) makes use of relatively elementary methods. However, a more sophisticated approach should also be possible. Equation (1) posits that $\sum_{i=0}^{m} f_i \mathbf{x}_i$ is a point in the $(m-1)$th secant variety of a Chow variety parametrizing degree d products of linear forms. Equations for the Chow variety are classical, going back to Brill and Gordan [GKZ08]. More recently, Y. Guan has provided some equations for secant varieties of Chow varieties [Gua15, Gua16] . It would be interesting to see if these equations shed light on the vanishing of the f_i from Equation (1).

Our motivation for studying $\mathbf{F}_k(X_{r,d})$ is twofold. Firstly, we wish to add to the body of examples of varieties X for which one understands the geometry of $\mathbf{F}_k(X)$. If the Fano scheme $\mathbf{F}_k(X_{r,d})$ is m-split for some $m < r$, k-dimensional linear subspaces of $X_{r,d}$ can be understood in terms of linear subspaces of $X_{r',d}$ for certain $r' < d$. We illustrate this by describing the irreducible components of

$\mathbf{F}_k(X_{r,d})$ for $k \geq (r-2)(d-1)+1$ whenever $r \leq d+1$ or $d=4$, see Examples 3.5 and 3.7. We also characterize when $\mathbf{F}_k(X_{r,d})$ is connected, see Theorem 3.4.

Secondly, we may use our results to obtain lower bounds on the *product rank* of certain linear forms. Recall that the *product rank* (also known as Chow rank) of a degree d form f is the smallest number r such that we can write

$$f = \boldsymbol{\ell}_1 + \ldots + \boldsymbol{\ell}_r$$

where the $\boldsymbol{\ell}_i$ are products of d linear forms. We denote the product rank of f by $\mathbf{pr}(f)$. Note that product rank may be used to give a lower bound on *tensor rank*, see [IT16, §1.3] for details. Generalizing [IT16, Theorem 3.1], we prove the following:

Theorem 1.7. *Let f be an irreducible degree $d>1$ form in $n+1$ variables such that $V(f) \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ is covered by k-planes, and let $r \in \mathbb{N}$ with $rd \geq n+1$.*

(1) If $\mathbf{F}_k(X_{r,d})$ is one-split, then $\mathbf{pr}(f) \neq r$.
(2) If r is even, $k > n-r$, and

$$\mathbf{F}_k(X_{r,d}),\ \mathbf{F}_{k-d}(X_{r-2,d}), \ldots,\ \mathbf{F}_{k-\frac{d(r-4)}{2}}(X_{4,d})$$

are two-split, then $\mathbf{pr}(f) \neq r$.

Applying this to the 3×3 determinant of a generic matrix, we recover that its product and tensor ranks are five [IT16]. Note that we have replaced the computer-aided computation of $\mathbf{F}_5(X_{3,4})$ with a conceptual proof. We may also apply Theorem 1.7 to the 4×4 determinant $\det_4$ of a generic matrix to obtain $\mathbf{pr}(\det_4) \geq 7$; this is equal to the lower bound one obtains from Derksen and Teitler's lower bound on the Waring rank [DT15]. In Example 4.4 we apply the theorem to the Pfaffian f of a generic 6×6 skew-symmetric matrix to obtain $\mathbf{pr}(f) \geq 7$, beating the previous lower bound of 6. Finally, in Example 4.5 we use a slightly different argument to obtain that the product rank (and tensor rank) of the 4×4 permanent is at least 6, beating the previous lower bound of 5.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In §2, we study equations of the form (1). We use this in §3 to show our splitting results for the Fano schemes $\mathbf{F}_k(X_{r,d})$, as well as studying several cases in more detail. Finally, we prove Theorem 1.7 in §4 and apply our results to a number of examples including the 6×6 Pfaffian and 4×4 permanent.

For simplicity, we will be working over an arbitrary algebraically closed field $\mathbb{K}$. Note however that all our main results clearly hold for arbitrary fields simply by restricting from $\mathbb{K}$ to any subfield.

2. Special Sums of Products of Linear Forms

2.1. **Preliminaries.** In this section we will prove that property C_m^d holds for $m \leq 2$ or $d \leq 4$. We will obtain this result by using induction arguments. These arguments involve a refined version of the C_m^d property. Consider an equation of the form

$$\boldsymbol{\ell}_1 + \ldots + \boldsymbol{\ell}_m = \sum_{i=1}^{k+n} f_i \mathbf{x}_i, \tag{2}$$

with $n > m$. As before, the $\mathbf{x}_i$ are pairwise coprime squarefree monomials and the $\boldsymbol{\ell}_i$ are degree d products of linear forms. We now assume simply that f_i are degree

$(d - \deg \mathbf{x}_i)$ forms, no longer requiring that they be products of linear forms. It will be convenient to order the summands on the right hand side so that

$$\deg \mathbf{x}_1 \leq \deg \mathbf{x}_2 \leq \ldots \leq \deg \mathbf{x}_{k+n}.$$

We will maintain this ordering convention throughout all of §2. Similar to the property C^d_m we make the following definition.

Definition 2.1 (Property $C^d_{k,m,n}$)**.** We say that $C^d_{k,m,n}$ is true, if for any equation of the form (2) satisfying

$$\deg \mathbf{x}_i + \deg \mathbf{x}_j \geq d+1 \qquad \text{for } i > k \tag{3}$$

$$\deg \mathbf{x}_i + \deg \mathbf{x}_j \geq d+2 \qquad \text{for } i, j > k. \tag{4}$$

it follows that there are $i_1, \ldots, i_{n-m} > k$ for which $f_{i_j} = 0$.

Note that by definition $C^d_{0,m,m+1}$ implies C^d_m.

Lemma 2.2. *Fix d and m and assume that $C^d_{k,m,m+1}$ holds for every $k \geq 0$. Then $C^d_{k,m,n}$ holds for every $n > m$.*

Proof. We may argue by induction on n. Obviously, the hypotheses for $C^d_{k,m,n}$ imply those for $C^d_{k+1,m,n-1}$. Hence, by the induction hypothesis we have the vanishing of $(n-m-1)$ of the f_i, with $i > k+1$. Using this we end up with the hypotheses for $C^d_{k,m,n-((n-m)-1)} = C^d_{k,m,m+1}$ being fulfilled, and we see that another of the f_i with $i > k$ has to vanish. □

2.2. **Property C^d_1.** We will first analyze the case $m = 1$. Therefore, we consider an equation of the form

$$\boldsymbol{\ell} = \sum_{i=1}^{r} f_i \mathbf{x}_i \tag{5}$$

with f_i forms of degree $(d - \deg \mathbf{x}_i)$. As before, we order indices such that $\deg \mathbf{x}_1 \leq \deg \mathbf{x}_2 \leq \ldots \leq \deg \mathbf{x}_r$.

Remark 2.3 (Cancellation)**.** Assume we are given a variable x which divides $\boldsymbol{\ell}$, one monomial $\mathbf{x}_i$, and all f_j for $j \neq i$. Setting

$$\boldsymbol{\ell}' = \boldsymbol{\ell}/x \qquad \mathbf{x}'_j = \begin{cases} \mathbf{x}_j/x & i = j \\ \mathbf{x}_j & i \neq j \end{cases} \qquad f'_j = \begin{cases} f_j/x & i \neq j \\ f_j & i = j \end{cases}$$

leads to

$$\boldsymbol{\ell}' = \sum_{i=1}^{r} f'_i \mathbf{x}'_i$$

where we have reduced from forms of degree d to degree $d-1$. We call this the *cancellation* of (5) by x.

Lemma 2.4. *Let l be a linear form dividing $\sum f_i \mathbf{x}_i$, where the f_i are forms of degree $(d - \deg \mathbf{x}_i)$.*

1. *If $\deg \mathbf{x}_1 + \deg \mathbf{x}_2 \geq d+2$, then for all i, l divides $\mathbf{x}_i$ or f_i.*
2. *If $\deg \mathbf{x}_1 + \deg \mathbf{x}_2 \geq d+1$ and l is a monomial, then for all i, l divides $\mathbf{x}_i$ or f_i.*

Proof. We first prove the second statement. We have

$$\sum f_i \mathbf{x}_i = xg$$

for some variable x and form g. Expanding the left hand side as a sum of monomials, we see that the degree condition ensures that no terms from $f_i\mathbf{x}_i$ cancel with $f_j\mathbf{x}_j$ for $i \neq j$. But every monomial on the right hand side is divisible by x, hence also on the left hand side. The claim follows.

For the first statement, we reduce to the second by performing a change of coordinates taking l to a monomial. This can be achieved while preserving all variables in the $\mathbf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_r$ with at most one exception, say in $\mathbf{x}_i$. After factoring out this one linear form from $\mathbf{x}_i$, the pairwise of sum degrees is still at least $d+1$ and we may apply the second claim. □

Lemma 2.5. *Suppose $\boldsymbol{\ell} = \sum_{i=1}^{r} f_i\mathbf{x}_i$ for $r \geq 2$, f_i forms of degree $(d - \deg \mathbf{x}_i)$. Let λ be the number of distinct factors of $\boldsymbol{\ell}$. If*

$$\left\lceil \frac{\prod \deg \mathbf{x}_i}{\lambda} \right\rceil > \frac{\prod \deg \mathbf{x}_i}{\deg \mathbf{x}_1 \cdot \deg \mathbf{x}_2}$$

then there is a variable x dividing both $\boldsymbol{\ell}$ and one of the $\mathbf{x}_i$. This is true if $\deg \mathbf{x}_1 \cdot \deg \mathbf{x}_2 > \lambda$, in particular if $\deg \mathbf{x}_1 \cdot \deg \mathbf{x}_2 > d$.

Proof. For each $\mathbf{x}_i$, choose some variable x_i dividing it. Setting $x_1 = x_2 = \ldots = x_r = 0$ will result in the equality $\boldsymbol{\ell} = 0$, hence one factor of $\boldsymbol{\ell}$ can only depend on $x_1, \ldots, x_r$. There are $\prod_i \deg \mathbf{x}_i$ possible ways to choose the x_i, and λ factors of $\boldsymbol{\ell}$, so there must be one factor of $\boldsymbol{\ell}$ which depends only on the $x_1, \ldots, x_r$ for

$$\left\lceil \frac{\prod \deg \mathbf{x}_i}{\lambda} \right\rceil$$

different choices. On the other hand, the intersection of more than

$$\frac{\prod \deg \mathbf{x}_i}{\deg \mathbf{x}_1 \cdot \deg \mathbf{x}_2}$$

choices of the $x_1, \ldots, x_r$ contains at most one variable. Hence, if the above inequality is satisfied, the claim follows. □

Proposition 2.6. *Suppose*

$$\boldsymbol{\ell} = f_1\mathbf{x}_1 + f_2\mathbf{x}_2$$

with f_i forms of degree $(d - \deg \mathbf{x}_i)$.

1. *If $\deg \mathbf{x}_1 + \deg \mathbf{x}_2 \geq d+2$, then either f_1 or f_2 vanishes.*
2. *If $\boldsymbol{\ell}$ is not squarefree and $\deg \mathbf{x}_1 + \deg \mathbf{x}_2 \geq d+1$, then either f_1 or f_2 vanishes.*

In particular, property C_1^d holds for every $d > 0$.

Proof. For the first case, note that the hypothesis $\deg \mathbf{x}_1 + \deg \mathbf{x}_2 \geq d+2$ implies in particular that $\deg \mathbf{x}_1 \geq 2$ and $\deg \mathbf{x}_1 \cdot \deg \mathbf{x}_2 > d$. Hence, Lemma 2.5 implies the existence of a variable x dividing both $\boldsymbol{\ell}$ and one of the $\mathbf{x}_i$. But then $f_j\mathbf{x}_j$ is divisible by x for $j \neq i$, hence x divides f_j. Cancelling by x, we may proceed by induction on the degree d.

For the second case, we proceed with a similar argument. The inequality

$$\deg \mathbf{x}_1 + \deg \mathbf{x}_2 \geq d+1$$

implies that $\deg \mathbf{x}_1 \cdot \deg \mathbf{x}_2 > d-1$, which is larger than or equal to the number of distinct factors of $\boldsymbol{\ell}$. Thus, we again find a variable x dividing both $\boldsymbol{\ell}$ and one of the $\mathbf{x}_i$. If in fact x^2 divides $\boldsymbol{\ell}$, then after factoring out one power of x from $\mathbf{x}_i$ and f_j, Lemma 2.4 guarantees that x divides f_i as well. Dividing $\boldsymbol{\ell}$, f_i, and f_j by x, we reduce to the first case.

If x^2 does not divide $\boldsymbol{\ell}$, we may cancel by x as in the first case, maintaining that $\boldsymbol{\ell}/x$ is still not squarefree. To finish, we again proceed by induction on the degree d. □

Remark 2.7. It is clear that the degree bounds in Proposition 2.6 cannot be improved upon. If $\deg \mathbf{x}_1 + \deg \mathbf{x}_2 = d+1$ and x_1, x_2 are variables dividing $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2$ respectively, then setting $f_i = \mathbf{x}_i/x_i$ gives

$$f_1\mathbf{x}_1 + f_2\mathbf{x}_2 = (x_1+x_2)\frac{\mathbf{x}_1}{x_1}\frac{\mathbf{x}_2}{x_2}.$$

Likewise, if $\deg \mathbf{x}_1 + \deg \mathbf{x}_2 \leq d$ there are non-trivial degree d syzygies between $\mathbf{x}_1$ and $\mathbf{x}_2$, so we cannot expect the second claim to hold.

We next prove a stronger version of $C^d_{k,1,2}$.

Proposition 2.8. *Suppose for $r \geq 3$,*

$$\boldsymbol{\ell} = \sum_{i=1}^{r} f_i \mathbf{x}_i \tag{6}$$

with f_i forms of degree $(d - \deg \mathbf{x}_i)$. Then if $\deg \mathbf{x}_1 + \deg \mathbf{x}_{r-1} \geq d+1$, some f_i with $\deg \mathbf{x}_i \geq \deg \mathbf{x}_{r-1}$ must vanish.

In particular, $C^d_{k,1,2}$ holds for every $d > 0$, $k \geq 0$.

Proof. Set $\alpha = \deg \mathbf{x}_1$ and $\beta = \deg \mathbf{x}_{r-1}$. Note that it suffices to prove the proposition in the case that $\deg \mathbf{x}_1 = \ldots = \deg \mathbf{x}_{r-2} = \alpha$ and $\deg \mathbf{x}_{r-1} = \deg \mathbf{x}_r = \beta$. Indeed, we may absorb variables from $\mathbf{x}_2, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{r-2}, \mathbf{x}_r$ into the corresponding f_i to reduce to this case. Henceforth we will assume we are in such a situation.

We begin by proving the claim when $r = 3$ and $\alpha = 1$, that is, $\mathbf{x}_1$ is a single variable x. Using Proposition 2.6(1), we see that modulo x either f_2 or f_3 vanish. But since $\alpha + \beta \geq d+1$, f_2 and f_3 are both just constants, hence one must vanish outright.

Next, we consider the case when $r = 3$ and $\alpha > 1$. First, we show that some f_i must vanish, with no restriction on its degree. We apply Lemma 2.5 to find a variable x dividing some monomial $\mathbf{x}_i$ and ℓ. Applying Lemma 2.4, we may conclude that x divides f_j for $j \neq i$. Cancelling by x we may reduce the degree by one and conclude by induction on degree that $f_i = 0$ for some i. Now we show that we can impose the desired degree restriction on f_i. Indeed, if $i = 2, 3$, or $i = 1$ and $\alpha = \beta$, this is automatic. If instead $i = 1$ and $\alpha < \beta$, then we have $\boldsymbol{\ell} = f_2\mathbf{x}_2 + f_3\mathbf{x}_3$ satisfying the hypotheses of Proposition 2.6(1), from which the claim follows.

It remains to consider the cases when $r \geq 4$. We will now induct on r. First assume that $\alpha < \beta$. By setting any variable x in $\mathbf{x}_i$ equal to zero for $i \leq r-2$, we reduce to an equation of the form (6) with one fewer summand on the right hand side, yet α, β, and d the same. Hence, by induction, x divides f_{r-1} or f_r. Now, there are $\alpha \cdot (r-2)$ variables appearing in the $\mathbf{x}_i$ for $i \leq r-2$, yet

$$\deg f_{r-1} + \deg f_r = 2(d-\beta) \leq 2(\alpha - 1).$$

Thus, if $r > 3$ then either f_{r-1} or f_r must vanish.

If instead $r \geq 4$ and $\alpha = \beta$, we may again apply Lemma 2.5 followed by Lemma 2.4 to find a variable x dividing some $\mathbf{x}_i$ and f_j for $j \neq i$. Note that we may reorder the monomials such that $i = 1$, since all have the same degree α. Cancelling by x, we again find ourselves in the situation of (6), but now with $\alpha < \beta$, so by the above, xf_{r-1} or xf_r vanishes, thus f_{r-1} or f_r does as well. □

Remark 2.9. Proposition 2.8 is sharp in the following sense. Suppose that in (6), we have $\deg \mathbf{x}_1 + \deg \mathbf{x}_{r-1} \leq d$. Then *none* of the f_i need vanish. Indeed, for $i = 2, \ldots, r-1$ we can take $f_i = g_i \mathbf{x}_1$ for any forms g_i of degree $(d - \deg \mathbf{x}_1 - \deg \mathbf{x}_i)$, and

$$f_1 = \sum_{i=2}^{r-1} -g_i \mathbf{x}_i.$$

Then

$$\sum_{i=1}^{r} f_i \mathbf{x}_i = f_r \mathbf{x}_r$$

so if f_r is a product of linear forms, then so is the whole sum, yet for appropriate choice of g_i none of the f_i will vanish.

2.3. **Property C_2^d.** We now move to the case of C_2^d:

Proposition 2.10. *Suppose*

$$\boldsymbol{\ell}_1 + \boldsymbol{\ell}_2 = f_1 \mathbf{x}_1 + f_2 \mathbf{x}_2 + f_3 \mathbf{x}_3 \tag{7}$$

with f_i forms of degree $(d - \deg \mathbf{x}_i)$. If $\deg \mathbf{x}_1 + \deg \mathbf{x}_2 \geq d + 2$, then either f_1, f_2, or f_3 vanishes.

In particular, C_2^d holds for every $d > 0$.

Proof. We will prove the statement by induction on the degree d. Note that if we can show that $\boldsymbol{\ell}_1, \boldsymbol{\ell}_2$ have a common factor l, then we are done. Indeed, by Lemma 2.4, l must divide either each $\mathbf{x}_i$ or f_i. Pulling l out of each f_i where we can, and out of $\mathbf{x}_i$ in at most one position, allows us to "cancel by l" in a fashion similar to Remark 2.3. We thus reduce the degree and the claim follows by induction.

In the following, we will assume that no common factor l of $\boldsymbol{\ell}_1$ and $\boldsymbol{\ell}_2$ exists, and that all f_i are non-zero. For simplicity, we may assume that $\deg \mathbf{x}_2 = \deg \mathbf{x}_3$, since this case implies the more general one. We denote $\deg \mathbf{x}_1$ by α, and $\deg \mathbf{x}_2$ by β. Our hypothesis on degrees is now simply $\alpha + \beta \geq d + 2$.

Consider any factor l of $\boldsymbol{\ell}_1$ or $\boldsymbol{\ell}_2$. Setting $l = 0$, we reduce to the case of Proposition 2.6(1) (if l divides some $\mathbf{x}_i$) or Proposition 2.8 (by absorbing into some f_i a variable of $\mathbf{x}_i$ made linear dependent modulo l). In either case, we see that modulo l, some f_i must vanish, that is, l is a factor of f_i. We may proceed to do this for all distinct divisors of $\boldsymbol{\ell}_1$ and $\boldsymbol{\ell}_2$. But since

$$\deg f_1 + \deg f_2 + \deg f_3 \leq 2(d - \beta) + (d - \alpha),$$

we conclude that together $\boldsymbol{\ell}_1$ and $\boldsymbol{\ell}_2$ have at most

$$2(d - \beta) + (d - \alpha) \leq 2d - \beta - 2$$

distinct factors. It follows that either both $\boldsymbol{\ell}_1$ and $\boldsymbol{\ell}_2$ contain a square, or else that the non-squarefree product has at most $d - \beta - 2$ distinct factors.

Assume first that $\boldsymbol{\ell}_1$ is squarefree, and fix some factor l. We now argue in a similar fashion to the proof of Lemma 2.5. For each $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_3$, fix a variable y_i so

that l and all remaining variables are linearly independent. For each $\mathbf{x}_i$, choose some variable $x_i \neq y_i$ dividing $\mathbf{x}_i$. Setting $x_1 = x_2 = x_3 = 0$ will result in the equality $\boldsymbol{\ell}_1 = -\boldsymbol{\ell}_2$, hence one factor of $\boldsymbol{\ell}_2$ is zero modulo $x_1, \ldots, x_m, l$. There are $(\alpha-1)(\beta-1)^2$ possible ways to choose the x_i, and at most $d-\beta-2$ factors of $\boldsymbol{\ell}_2$, so there must be one fixed factor of $\boldsymbol{\ell}_2$ which is zero mod $x_1, \ldots, x_m, l$ for

$$\left\lceil \frac{(\alpha-1)(\beta-1)^2}{d-\beta-2} \right\rceil$$

different choices. On the other hand, the intersection of more than β^2 choices of the $x_1, \ldots, x_m$ contains no variable. Hence, since $d-\beta-2 < \alpha-1$ it follows that there is a factor of $\boldsymbol{\ell}_2$ which is zero modulo l, that is, agrees with it.

We now instead assume that both $\boldsymbol{\ell}_1$ and $\boldsymbol{\ell}_2$ contain factors with multiplicity at least two. Consider any factor l of $\boldsymbol{\ell}_1$ or $\boldsymbol{\ell}_2$. As long as l is not a variable in $\mathbf{x}_2$ or $\mathbf{x}_3$, we may set $l = 0$ and conclude that l divides f_2 or f_3. Indeed, if l divides $\mathbf{x}_1$ this follows from Proposition 2.6. Otherwise we may absorb into some f_i a variable of $\mathbf{x}_i$ made linear dependent modulo l, and then apply Proposition 2.8 followed by Proposition 2.6(2) to conclude that two of f_1, f_2, and f_3 vanish modulo l.

If at most one factor l of $\boldsymbol{\ell}_1$, $\boldsymbol{\ell}_2$ divides $\mathbf{x}_2$ or $\mathbf{x}_3$ but not f_2 or f_3, we thus obtain that $\boldsymbol{\ell}_1, \boldsymbol{\ell}_2$ have at most $1+2(d-\beta)$ distinct factors. But then either $\boldsymbol{\ell}_1$ or $\boldsymbol{\ell}_2$ has at most $d-\beta$ distinct factors, so an argument similar to the case $\boldsymbol{\ell}_1$ squarefree above shows that $\boldsymbol{\ell}_1$ and $\boldsymbol{\ell}_2$ would have to possess a common factor.

So we now finally consider the case that at least two distinct factors x, y of $\boldsymbol{\ell}_1, \boldsymbol{\ell}_2$ are variables found in $\mathbf{x}_2$ and $\mathbf{x}_3$, neither dividing f_2 or f_3. It follows by Proposition 2.6 that each such factor must divide f_1. Without loss of generality, we assume that x divides $\mathbf{x}_3$ and $\boldsymbol{\ell}_1$. We obtain

$$\boldsymbol{\ell}_2 \equiv f_2 \mathbf{x}_2 \mod x,$$

so $\boldsymbol{\ell}_2$ has β factors which only depend on x and a single variable of $\mathbf{x}_2$.

If y divides $\mathbf{x}_3$ and $\boldsymbol{\ell}_2$, then setting $x = y = 0$, we obtain $f_2\mathbf{x}_2 \equiv 0 \mod x, y$, a contradiction. If instead y divides $\mathbf{x}_3$ and $\boldsymbol{\ell}_1$ we obtain

$$\boldsymbol{\ell}_2 \equiv f_2 \mathbf{x}_2 \mod y$$

and $\boldsymbol{\ell}_2$ has β factors which only depend on y and a single variable of $\mathbf{x}_2$. Since $\boldsymbol{\ell}_2$ has $d < 2\beta$ factors, one must also just be a variable w of $\mathbf{x}_2$. So in this case, we conclude that a variable w of $\mathbf{x}_2$ divides $\boldsymbol{\ell}_2$. If instead y divides $\mathbf{x}_2$, we see by setting $x = 0$ that y must divide $\boldsymbol{\ell}_2$, so we can take $w = y$ to produce w as above.

We thus may assume that we are in the situation of variables x, w with x dividing $\mathbf{x}_3$ and $\boldsymbol{\ell}_1$, and w dividing $\mathbf{x}_2$. By Proposition 2.6, w divides f_j for $j = 1$ or $j = 3$. Now let $k \in \{1, 3\}$ be such that $i \neq j$. We thus obtain

$$\boldsymbol{\ell}_1 \equiv f_k \mathbf{x}_k \mod w,$$

hence $\boldsymbol{\ell}_1$ has $\deg \mathbf{x}_k$ factors which depend on w and a single variable of $\mathbf{x}_k$.

The right hand side of Equation (7) clearly contains monomials divisible by $\mathbf{x}_j$. But the left hand side cannot: while each monomial of $\boldsymbol{\ell}_1$ has degree at least $\deg \mathbf{x}_k$ in the variables of $\mathbf{x}_k$ and w, and each monomial of $\boldsymbol{\ell}_2$ has degree at least $\beta = \deg \mathbf{x}_2$ in the variables of $\mathbf{x}_2$ and x, the part of $\mathbf{x}_j$ relatively prime to x has degree at least $\deg \mathbf{x}_j - 1$. The inequality

$$\deg \mathbf{x}_j - 1 + \deg \mathbf{x}_k \geq d + 1$$

then shows that this impossible. We conclude that in fact some f_i must equal zero. □

Remark 2.11. Proposition 2.10 is optimal. Indeed, suppose that $\deg \mathbf{x}_1 + \deg \mathbf{x}_2 \leq d+1$. Then by Remark 2.7, for appropriate non-vanishing choices of f_1, f_2, $f_1\mathbf{x}_1 + f_x\mathbf{x}_2$ is a product of linear forms, so $f_1\mathbf{x}_1 + f_2\mathbf{x}_2 + f_3\mathbf{x}_3$ is a sum of two products of linear forms for any choice of f_3.

2.4. **Property C^d_m for $d \leq 4$.** We now prove a lemma that will help us with the degree four case:

Lemma 2.12. *Fix $d \geq 2$, $k > 0$, and $m > 0$ and let $n = m + 1$. Assume that $C^d_{k',m',n'}$ holds whenever $m' < m$, or whenever $m' = m$ and $k' < k$. In Equation (2), consider any linear form l dividing p of the summands $\boldsymbol{\ell}_i$ on the left hand side. Then l must also divide p of the f_i with $i > k$.*

Proof. Assume l divides some factor x_j of $\mathbf{x}_j$. Setting $l = 0$, we now have that the hypothesis for $C^d_{k,m-p,m}$ is fulfilled. Since we have assumed that $C^d_{k,m-p,m}$ is true, p of the f_i with $i > k$ must vanish modulo l.

If l does not divide any $\mathbf{x}_j$, we still may set $l = 0$, modifying the right hand side of the equation $\boldsymbol{\ell}_1 + \ldots + \boldsymbol{\ell}_m = \sum_{i=1}^{k+n} f_i\mathbf{x}_i$ to replace one factor of some $\mathbf{x}_j$ by a linear form f which is no longer a monomial. Now we have to distinguish two cases. Let us assume first that $j > k$. Then, since the degree of $\mathbf{x}_j$ drops by one, we are in the situation of $C^d_{k+1,m-p,m}$. As before by our assumption, p of the f_i with $i > k$ must vanish modulo l.

If $j \leq k$ then the fact that the degree of $\mathbf{x}_j$ drops may violated condition (4). However, we may bring the summand $f_j\mathbf{x}_j$ to the left hand side of the equation. This leaves us in the situation of $C^d_{k-1,m-p+1,m+1}$ and our assumption again provides the vanishing of p of the f_i, with $i > k$. □

We now use this lemma to show C^d_m for arbitrary m and $d \leq 4$:

Proposition 2.13. *If $d \leq 4$, property $C^d_{k,m,n}$ holds for arbitrary $k > 0$ and $n > m > 0$. In particular, C^d_m holds for $m > 0$.*

Proof. We will use induction on m and k. Note, that for $m = 1$ and k arbitrary, $C^d_{k,m,m+1}$ follows from Theorem 2.8. Lemma 2.2 then provides $C^d_{k,m,n}$ for arbitrary $n > m$. Assume we have proven property $C^d_{k',m',n'}$ is true whenever $m' < m$, or whenever $m' = m$ and $k' < k$. We must prove that property $C^d_{k,m,m+1}$ is true as well, which then again implies $C^d_{k,m,n}$ for $n > m$ by Lemma 2.2.

For $d \leq 4$ we have $\sum_{i>k} \deg f_i \leq m + 1$. Either one of the f_i has to vanish, which would prove our claim, or by Lemma 2.12, all the factors of the $\boldsymbol{\ell}_i$ occur as one of the (at most) $(m + 1)$ linear factors of the f_i for $i > k$. Let us partition the multiset of these linear factors in such a way that two of them are coprime exactly if they belong to different subsets. We say one of the subsets I covers $\boldsymbol{\ell}_i$ if $\boldsymbol{\ell}_i$ is divisible by the elements of I. In this way every, all the $\boldsymbol{\ell}_j$ have to be covered by one of the subsets of the partition. On the other hand, we have seen by Lemma 2.12 that every I may cover at most $p = \#I$ of the $\boldsymbol{\ell}_j$. Hence, there can be at most one $\boldsymbol{\ell}_j$ which is covered by more than one subset of the partition. This implies, we have $\boldsymbol{\ell}_i = l_i^d$ for all but one of the summands on the left hand side.

For $m > 2$ this implies that we can write the left hand side as the sum of only $(m-1)$ products, since we can write $l_i^d + l_j^d$ as a product of linear forms. Then using the induction hypothesis for $C^d_{k,m-1,m}$ concludes the proof for the case $m > 2$.

To conclude, we consider the case $m = 2$. If none of the f_i (with $i > k$) vanishes, we have seen that at most three linear factors l_1, l_2 and l_3 can occur on the left hand side. We choose $\lambda \in \mathbb{K}$ and set $l_2 = \lambda l_3$. Now, the left hand side depends only on two linear forms. In this situation the left hand side is actually a product of linear forms (since $\mathbb{K}$ is algebraically closed). In the same way as in the proof of Lemma 2.12 (when setting one of the l_i to zero) we see by the induction hypothesis that one of the f_i has to be divisible by $(l_2 - \lambda l_3)$. We have only finitely many choices for the linear factors of the f_i, but we have infinitely many choices for $\lambda \in \mathbb{K}$. Hence, there are $\lambda, \lambda' \in \mathbb{K}$ with $(l_2 - \lambda' l_3)$ dividing $(l_2 - \lambda l_3)$, which implies either $l_2 = 0$ or $l_3 = 0$. In any case, one of the summands $\boldsymbol{\ell}_1$ or $\boldsymbol{\ell}_2$ has to vanish, and we are in the case of $C^d_{k,1,3}$. □

2.5. **Consequences.** The following lemma derives a consequence of the property C^d_m which will be used later.

Lemma 2.14. *Consider an equation of the form*

$$\boldsymbol{\ell}_1 + \ldots + \boldsymbol{\ell}_m = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \mathbf{x}_i \tag{8}$$

where the $\boldsymbol{\ell}_i$ are degree $d \geq 3$ products of linear forms, and the $\mathbf{x}_i$ are pairwise relatively prime squarefree monomials of degree d. If property C^d_{m-1} is true, then there is a permutation $\sigma \in S_m$ such that $\boldsymbol{\ell}_i = \mathbf{x}_{\sigma(i)}$ for all i.

Proof. Consider any factor l_i of some $\boldsymbol{\ell}_i$. If l_i does not divide any $\mathbf{x}_j$, we may set $l_i = 0$, modifying the right hand side of Equation (8) to replace one factor of some $\mathbf{x}_j$ by a linear form f which is no longer a monomial. But this equation still satisfies the hypotheses necessary for C^d_{m-1}, as long as $d \geq 3$, so in fact, l_i must have divided one of the $\mathbf{x}_j$ all along.

We thus see that every factor of each $\boldsymbol{\ell}_i$ is just a variable, up to scaling. By comparing the monomials on both sides of (8), we find the desired permutation. □

Remark 2.15. We may interpret the above lemma geometrically as saying that, if C^{r-1}_d is true, then the subgroup of $PGL(rd-1)$ taking $X_{r,d}$ to itself is generated by the semidirect product of the torus

$$T = \{x_{11} \cdots x_{1d} = x_{21} \cdots x_{2d} = \ldots = x_{r1} \cdots x_{rd}\}$$

with the copy of the symmetric group S_r permuting the indices i of x_{ij}, and the r copies of S_d permuting the indices j of x_{ij} for some fixed $1 \leq i \leq r$.

3. Fano Schemes and Splitting

3.1. **Main results.** In this section, we will prove Theorems 1.5 and 1.6. For $n = rd - 1$, consider projective space $\mathbb{P}^n$ with coordinates x_{ij}, $1 \leq i \leq r$ and $1 \leq j \leq d$. Let L be a k-dimensional linear subspace of $\mathbb{P}^n$. We may represent L as the rowspan of a full rank $(k+1) \times rd$ matrix $B = (b_{\alpha,ij})$, with rows indexed by $\alpha = 0, \ldots, k$ and column ij corresponding to the homogeneous coordinates x_{ij} on $\mathbb{P}^n$. We define

linear forms y_{ij} in $S = \mathbb{K}[z_0, \ldots, z_k]$ by

$$y_{ij} = \sum_{\alpha} b_{\alpha,ij} z_\alpha,$$

along with degree d forms

$$\mathbf{y}_i = \prod_{j=1}^{d} y_{ij}.$$

The condition that L is contained in $X_{r,d}$ is equivalent to the condition

$$\sum_i \mathbf{y}_i = 0. \tag{9}$$

The condition that L is one-split is equivalent to the condition that some $\mathbf{y}_i$ vanishes.

Example 3.1 (k-planes which are not one-split)**.** For $r = 2m$ and $k = md - 1$, let L be any k-plane with y_{ij} all linearly independent for $i \leq m$, and $y_{(i+m)j} = y_{ij}$. Then clearly L is contained in $X_{r,d}$, but is not one-split (although it is two-split).

For $r = 2m + 1$, consider forms y_{ij} satisfying $\{y_{ij}\}_{i \leq m}$ and y_{r1} all linearly independent, $y_{(i+m)j} = y_{ij}$ for $i < m$, $y_{rj} = y_{(2m)j} = y_{mj}$ for $j > 1$, and $y_{(2m)1} = y_{m1} - y_{r1}$. Let L be the corresponding md-plane. Clearly L is contained in $X_{r,d}$, but is not one-split.

We thus see that the bound on k in Conjecture 1.2 is sharp.

We henceforth assume that $L \subset X_{r,d}$, that is, that $\sum_i \mathbf{y}_i = 0$, and that none of the $\mathbf{y}_i$ vanish, that is, $\mathbf{F}_k(X_{r,d})$ is not one-split. Without loss of generality, we may inductively reorder the forms $\mathbf{y}_i$ as follows: given $\mathbf{y}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{y}_s$, we take $\mathbf{y}_{s+1}$ to be any form such that the dimension of the vector space spanned by the $\{y_{ij}\}_{i \leq s+1}$ is maximal. We may then choose a new basis

$$z_{ij}, \qquad 1 \leq i \leq r \qquad 1 \leq j \leq \lambda_i;$$

for the degree one piece of S with the property that each z_{ij} is a factor of $\mathbf{y}_i$, and each factor of $\mathbf{y}_i$ is in the span of

$$\{z_{ij}\}_{1 \leq j \leq \lambda_i}.$$

By the way we have ordered the forms $\mathbf{y}_i$, this implies that $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \ldots \geq \lambda_r$.

We now will assume that

$$k \geq \begin{cases} \frac{r}{2} \cdot d - 1 & r \text{ even} \\ \frac{r-1}{2} \cdot d + 1 & r \text{ odd} \end{cases}.$$

Lemma 3.2. *For $s \geq 0$, suppose that $\lambda_{r-s} = 0$. If d is even, r is even and $d \geq r - 2s$, or r is odd and $r - 2s \leq 6$, then $\lambda_{s+1} + \lambda_{s+2} \geq d + 2$.*

Proof. We have that

$$k + 1 = \sum_{i=1}^{r} \lambda_i = \sum_{i=1}^{r-s-1} \lambda_i \leq sd + \sum_{i=s+1}^{r-s-1} \lambda_i.$$

Using our assumption on k we thus have

$$\sum_{i=s+1}^{r-s-1} \lambda_i \geq \begin{cases} \frac{r-2s}{2} \cdot d & r \text{ even} \\ \frac{r-2s-1}{2} \cdot d + 2 & r \text{ odd} \end{cases}. \tag{10}$$

Suppose that $\lambda_{s+1} + \lambda_{s+2} \leq d+1$. If d is even, then $\lambda_{s+2} \leq \frac{d}{2}$, and thus $\lambda_i \leq \frac{d}{2}$ for all $i \geq s+2$. But then

$$\sum_{i=s+1}^{r-s-1} \lambda_i \leq (d+1) + (r-2s-3)\frac{d}{2} = \frac{r-2s-1}{2} \cdot d + 1$$

contradicting (10), since $d \geq 3$.

Assume instead that d is odd. Then $\lambda_i \leq \frac{d+1}{2}$ for all $i \geq s+2$, so

$$\sum_{i=s+1}^{r-s-1} \lambda_i \leq (r-2s-1)\frac{d+1}{2}.$$

But this contradicts (10) if r is even and $d \geq r-2s$, or if r is odd and $r-2s \leq 6$. □

Proof of Theorem 1.5. First note that $\lambda_r = 0$. Indeed, if not, then $\mathbf{y}_r$ contains a factor which is not in the span of the factors of the $\mathbf{y}_i$ for $i < r$, so it is impossible to satisfy Equation (9). Suppose that we have inductively shown that $\lambda_{r-s} = 0$ for some $s \leq r/2$. Then by Lemma 3.2, we have that $\lambda_{s+1} + \lambda_{s+2} \geq d+2$. If $\lambda_{r-s-1} \neq 0$, we set $z_{i1} = 0$ for $i = s+3, \ldots, r-s-1$ and use property C^d_{s+1} applied to

$$-\sum_{i=r-s}^{r} \mathbf{y}_i = \sum_{i=1}^{s+2} \mathbf{y}_i \qquad \mod \{z_{i1}\}_{s+3 \leq i \leq r-s-1}$$

to conclude that some $\mathbf{y}_i$ for $i \leq s+2$ vanishes modulo $\{z_{i1}\}_{s+3 \leq i \leq r-s-1}$. But by our construction of the $\mathbf{y}_i$, this is impossible, and we conclude that $\lambda_{r-s-1=0}$.

We proceed in this fashion until we obtain $\lambda_s = 0$ for

$$s = \left\lceil \frac{r}{2} \right\rceil + 1.$$

If r is odd, we conclude again by Lemma 3.2 that $\lambda_{s-2} + \lambda_{s-1} \geq d+2$, and an appropriate application of property $C^d_{(r-1)/2}$ shows that some $\mathbf{y}_i$ must vanish, a contradiction. If r is even, we must have $\lambda_1 = \ldots = \lambda_{r/2} = d$. This is impossible if k satisfies the bound of Conjecture 1.2, completing the claim regarding one-splitting. For the claim regarding two-splitting, we may apply Lemma 2.14 to conclude that for each $i \leq r/2$, $\mathbf{y}_i = \mathbf{y}_j$ for some $j > r/2$. But this implies two-splitting. □

Proof of Theorem 1.6. The first part of the Theorem is simply Propositions 2.6, 2.10, and 2.13. The statement regarding Conjectures 1.2 and 1.3 following immediately from Theorem 1.5 except in the cases ($r = 4$, $d = 3$), ($r = 6$, $d = 3$). and ($r = 6$, $d = 5$). The obstruction in all these cases comes about that in the proof of Theorem 1.5, we cannot use Lemma 3.2 to conclude that $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 \geq d+2$. However, we may use Proposition 2.8 to compensate.

Consider for example the case $r = 6$, $d = 3$. If $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 \leq d+1 = 4$, then we must in fact have $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \ldots = \lambda_4 = 2$, and $\lambda_5 = 1$. Setting $z_{51} = 0$, we may apply Proposition 2.8 to reach a contradiction. Thus, $\lambda_5 = \lambda_6 = 0$. A similar argument shows that $\lambda_3 = 0$ as well, and we conclude as in the proof of Theorem 1.5. The other two cases are similar, and left to the reader. □

Remark 3.3. Consider the Fano scheme $\mathbf{F}_k(X_{r,d})$. If we only know that C^d_m is true for all $m \leq M$ for some M strictly less than $(r-1)/2$, we may still use the above arguments to conclude that $\mathbf{F}_k(X_{r,d})$ is one-split if k is sufficiently large.

For example, we know that C_m^d is always true for $m = 1, 2$. For $r \leq 6$, we already know by Theorem 1.6 exactly when $\mathbf{F}_k(X_{r,d})$ is one-split, so assume that $r \geq 7$. We claim that if $k \geq d(r-3)$, then $\mathbf{F}_k(X_{r,d})$ must be one-split. Indeed, if d is even, Lemma 3.2 applies and arguing as in the proof of Theorem 1.6 shows that if L is not one-split, then $\lambda_r = \lambda_{r-1} = \lambda_{r-2} = 0$. But this contradicts $k \geq d(r-3)$. For d odd, slightly more care is needed. Assume some k-plane L is not one-split. The arguments from Lemma 3.2 will apply if

$$k \geq \frac{(r-1)(d+1)}{2},$$

in which case we are done as above. But this inequality is satisfied except for the case $r = 7$, $d = 3$. As always, $\lambda_7 = 0$. But certainly $\lambda_2 + \lambda_3 \geq d + 1 = 4$, so using Proposition 2.8 in place of C_1^3 we conclude that $\lambda_6 = 0$. But then one easily verifies that $\lambda_2 + \lambda_3 \geq d + 2 = 5$, so $\lambda_5 = 0$, which is impossible.

3.2. **Consequences and examples.** We now want to use our results on splitting to study the geometry of $\mathbf{F}_k(X_{r,d})$. We first note the following result:

Theorem 3.4. *The Fano scheme $\mathbf{F}_k(X_{r,d})$ is non-empty if and only if $k < r(d-1)$. Such a Fano scheme is connected if and only if $k < r(d-1) - 1$.*

Proof. Consider the subtorus T of $(\mathbb{K}^*)^{rd}$ cut out by

$$x_{11}x_{12}\cdots x_{1d} = x_{21}x_{22}\cdots x_{2d} = \ldots = x_{r1}x_{r1}\cdots x_{rd}.$$

This torus acts naturally on $\mathbb{P}^{rd-1}$. Since it fixes $X_{r,d}$, this action induces an action on $X_{r,d}$, and hence also on $\mathbf{F}_k(X_{r,d})$. It is straightforward to check that the only k-planes of $\mathbb{P}^{rd-1}$ fixed by T are intersections of coordinate hyperplanes. Thus, any torus fixed point of $\mathbf{F}_k(X_{r,d})$ corresponds to a k-plane L whose associated non-zero forms y_{ij} of §3.1 are all linearly independent.

Recall that such a k-plane L is contained in $\mathbf{F}_k(X_{r,d})$ if and only if Equation (9) is satisfied. But since by assumption the non-zero y_{ij} are linearly independent, this is equivalent to requiring that for each i, there is some j such that $y_{ij} = 0$. Since every component of $\mathbf{F}_k(X_{r,d})$ must contain a torus fixed point, it follows immediately that if $k \geq r(d-1)$, $\mathbf{F}_k(X_{r,d})$ must be empty. The non-emptiness of $\mathbf{F}_k(X_{r,d})$ for $k < r(d-1)$ is also clear.

Assume now that $k = r(d-1) - 1$. By Remark 3.3, it inductively follows that any k-plane of $X_{r,d}$ must be torus fixed. But there are r^d such fixed k-planes, so $\mathbf{F}_k(X_{r,d})$ is not connected.

Suppose finally that $k < r(d-1)-1$, and let L be a torus fixed k-plane contained in $\mathbf{F}_k(X_{r,d})$. We prove that $\mathbf{F}_k(X_{r,d})$ is connected by deforming L to a k-plane satisfying

$$y_{11} = y_{21} = \ldots = y_{r1} = 0.$$

Since the set of all such k-planes forms a connected subscheme of $\mathbf{F}_k(X_{r,d})$ isomorphic to the Grassmannian $G(k+1, r(d-1))$, and every irreducible component of the Fano scheme contains a torus fixed point, it follows that $\mathbf{F}_k(X_{r,d})$ is connected.

To see that we can deform L to a k-plane of the desired type, let $j_1, \ldots, j_r$ be such that $y_{1j_1}, \ldots, y_{rj_r}$ all vanish; these must exist since L is torus fixed and contained in $X_{r,d}$. Let i be the smallest index for which $j_i \neq 1$. The set of all k-planes satisfying $y_{1j_1} = \ldots = y_{rj_r} = 0$ forms a closed subscheme of $\mathbf{F}_k(X_{r,d})$ isomorphic to $G(k+1, r(d-1))$. Since $k < r(d-1) - 1$, this set contains a k-plane L' satisfying $y_{i1} = 0$ along with $y_{1j_1} = \ldots = y_{rj_r} = 0$, and L deforms to L'.

Replacing L with L' we can continue this procedure until we arrive at a k-plane satisfying $y_{11} = y_{21} = \ldots = y_{r1} = 0$ as desired. □

We now illustrate on several examples how our results help determine the irreducible component structure of $\mathbf{F}_k(X_{r,d})$.

Example 3.5 ($\mathbf{F}_k(X_{r,d})$ for $k \geq (r-2)(d-1)+2$)**.** For $k \geq (r-2)(d-1)+2$ and $r \geq 3$, Conjecture 1.2 would imply that $\mathbf{F}_k(X_{r,d})$ is one-split. Assume this to be true. Considering any k-plane L contained in $X_{r,d}$, we know that some x_{ij} must vanish. Intersecting L with $x_{i1} = x_{i2} = \ldots = x_{id} = 0$, we obtain a linear subspace L' in $X_{r-1,d}$ of dimension k', where $k' \geq k-(d-1) \geq (r-3)(d-1)+2$. Hence, L' is also (conjecturally) one-split, as long as $r-1 \geq 3$. We may proceed in this fashion until we obtain a linear subspace L'' in $X_{2,d}$ of dimension k'', where $k'' \geq k-(r-2)(d-1) \geq 2$. If L'' is also one-split, then L is contained in an $(r(d-1)-1)$-plane of the form

$$x_{1j_1} = x_{2j_2} = \ldots = x_{rj_r} = 0$$

for some choice of $j_1, \ldots, j_r$. The k-planes in this fixed $(r(d-1)-1)$-plane are parametrized by the Grassmannian $G(k+1, r(d-1))$. This leads to d^r irreducible components of $\mathbf{F}_k(X_{r,d})$, each isomorphic in its reduced structure to $G(k+1, r(d-1))$.

If on the other hand L'' is not one-split, then Equation (9) implies that after some permutation in the j indices, y_{1j} and y_{2j} are linearly dependent for all j. In particular, L'' is contained in a $(d-1)$-plane of $X_{2,d}$, appearing in a $d-1$-dimensional family. Thus, the plane L is contained in an $(r-1)(d-1)$-plane of $X_{r,d}$, which is moving in a $(d-1)$-dimensional family. Note that this only can occur if $k \leq (r-1)(d-1)$. In such cases, it follows that the corresponding irreducible component of $\mathbf{F}_k(X_{r,d})$ has dimension $(d-1)+(k+1)((r-1)(d-1)-k)$, and there are

$$\binom{r}{2} d^{r-2} \cdot (d!)$$

such components.

To summarize, the Fano scheme has two types of irreducible components:

- **Type A**: d^r components of dimension $(k+1)(r(d-1)-(k+1))$, isomorphic in their reduced structures to a Grassmannian; general k-planes in such components are contained in the intersection of r coordinate hyperplanes.
- **Type B**: Assuming $k \leq (r-1)(d-1)$, $\binom{r}{2} d^{r-2} \cdot (d!)$ components of dimension $(d-1)+(k+1)((r-1)(d-1)-k)$; general k-planes in such components are contained in the intersection of $(r-2)$ coordinate hyperplanes.

This analysis relied on Conjecture 1.2. By Theorem 1.6, this holds true if $r \leq 6$ or $d = 4$, so we know our above conclusions are true as long as this is satisfied. Furthermore, by Remark 3.3, the one-splitting we need follows if $k \geq d(r-3)$. But this is always satisfied as long as $r \leq d+2$.

The above example is somewhat elementary, since all the Fano schemes appearing in the reduction steps are one-split or two-split. However, if we understand the structure of a Fano scheme which isn't one-split (or even two-split), we can leverage this to an understanding of $\mathbf{F}_k(X_{r,d})$ for larger values of r. We will illustrate in the next two examples.

Example 3.6 (Special components of $\mathbf{F}_d(X_{3,d})$)**.** By Example 3.1, we know that $\mathbf{F}_d(X_{3,d})$ is not one-split; since $r = 3$, it is also not two-split. Nonetheless, with a bit of work, we can completely describe these Fano schemes. In this example, we will describe a special type of irreducible component; all components will be dealt with in Example 3.7.

We begin with the case $d = 2$ (although we usually have been assuming $d > 2$). Let L be any 2-plane of $X_{3,2}$ which is not one-split. After re-ordering indices, we may assume that y_{11}, y_{12}, and y_{21} are linearly independent. Setting $y_{11} = y_{21} = 0$, we see that either y_{31} or y_{32} depends only on y_{11}, y_{21}. A similar statement holds when setting $y_{12} = y_{21} = 0$. We conclude that, up to permutation of y_{31} and y_{32},

$$y_{31} = \alpha y_{11} + \alpha a y_{21}$$
$$y_{32} = \beta y_{12} + \beta b y_{21}$$

since if e.g. y_{31} depended only on y_{21}, then y_{21} must divide $y_{11}y_{12}$, a contradiction. Now using Equation (9), we conclude that

$$y_{22} = -by_{11} - ay_{12} - aby_{21}$$

and that $\alpha\beta = -1$. Note that for any choice of $i \neq j$ and l, y_{i1}, y_{i2}, y_{jl} are linearly independent, so our initial assumption was unnecessary. We thus see that there are exactly two components of $\mathbf{F}_2(X_{3,2})$ not consisting of only one-split 2-planes, corresponding to our above choice of permutation of y_{31} and y_{32}. Each component has dimension three. Utilizing the natural action of $(\mathbb{K}^*)^3$ and considering the weights of the non-vanishing Plücker coordinates, we see that these components are both isomorphic to the three-dimensional non-normal projective toric variety corresponding to the configuration of lattice points

$$\begin{array}{rrr} \pm e_1, & \pm e_2, & \pm e_3 \\ -e_1 + e_2 + e_3, & e_1 - e_2 + e_3, & e_1 + e_2 - e_3 \\ & -e_1 - e_2 - e_3 & \end{array}$$

in $\mathbb{Z}^3$. See [CLS11] for details on toric varieties.

We now suppose that $d > 2$. Let L be a d-plane of $X_{3,d}$ which is not one-split. After reordering indices, we may assume that $y_{11}, \ldots, y_{1\lambda_1}, y_{21}, \ldots, y_{2\lambda_2}$ are linearly independent, with $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 \geq d + 1$ and $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2$. If $\lambda_2 = 1$, then we may replace λ_1 with $\lambda_1 - 1$ and λ_2 with $\lambda_2 + 1$, unless all y_{2j} are linearly dependent. But this is easily seen to contradict Equation (9). So we may assume that $\lambda_2 \geq 2$.

For each choice y_{1j_1}, y_{2j_2} with $j_i \leq \lambda_i$, we find that one y_{3j} depends only on y_{1j_1}, y_{2j_2}. A simple counting argument shows that some y_{3j} can only depend on some y_{1j_1} or y_{2j_2}. But by Equation (9), this form must also divide some $y_{2j_2'}$ or respectively $y_{1j_1'}$ (for $j_i' > \lambda_i$). Factoring this out of Equation (9), we arrive at the situation of a k'-plane in $X_{3,d-1}$, with $k' \geq d - 1$. If $k' > d - 1$, then this plane is one-split, contradicting our assumption, so in fact $k' = d - 1$. We continue in this fashion of reducing degree until we arrive at one of the two toric components of $\mathbf{F}_2(X_{3,2})$. The component of $\mathbf{F}_d(X_{3,d})$ is a $(d-2)$-fold iterated $\mathbb{P}^2$ bundle over the toric component, and hence has dimension $3 + 2(d-2) = 2d - 1$. There are

$$2 \cdot \binom{d}{2}^3 ((d-2)!)^2$$

such components: we choose one of two toric components of $\mathbf{F}_2(X_{3,2})$; then for each index i we choose two of the y_{ij} which are not getting factored out. We then match each of the remaining y_{1j} with a $y_{2j'}$ and $y_{3j''}$, of which there are $((d-2)!)^2$ ways.

We now leverage the above example to lower the bound on k in Example 3.5 by one:

Example 3.7 ($\mathbf{F}_k(X_{r,d})$ for $k=(r-2)(d-1)+1$)**.** Let L be any k-plane of $X_{r,d}$, for $k=(r-2)(d-1)+1$. Similar to in Example 3.5, Conjecture 1.2 would imply that L is one-split, as long as $r\geq 5$. As in Example 3.5, we successively reduce to a k'-plane in $X_{4,d}$, with $k'\geq 2(d-1)+1=2d-1$. By Theorem 1.6, L' is two-split.

Suppose first that L' is not one-split. Then after permuting $\{1,2,3,4\}$, we may assume that $\mathbf{y}_1+\mathbf{y}_2=\mathbf{y}_3+\mathbf{y}_4=0$. The factors of $\mathbf{y}_1$ and $\mathbf{y}_2$ must agree up to scaling, and similarly for $\mathbf{y}_3$ and $\mathbf{y}_4$. Similar to the component of type B in Example 3.5, we see that L' is a $2d-1$-plane of $X_{4,d}$, moving in a $2(d-1)$-dimensional family. Thus, the plane L also is moving in a $2(d-1)$-dimensional family. It follows that the corresponding irreducible component of $\mathbf{F}_k(X_{r,d})$ has dimension $2(d-1)$, and there are

$$\binom{r}{r-4,2,2}d^{r-4}\cdot(d!)^2$$

such components.

If L' is one-split, we may reduce further to a k''-plane L'' in $X_{3,d}$ with $k''\geq d$. Suppose next that L'' is not one-split. Then $k''=d$, and L'' corresponds to a point in one of the $(2d-1)$-dimensional irreducible components described in Example 3.6. It follows that the corresponding irreducible component of $\mathbf{F}_k(X_{r,d})$ has dimension $2d-1$, and there are

$$\binom{r}{3}d^{r-3}\cdot 2\cdot\binom{d}{2}^3((d-2)!)^2$$

such components.

Finally, if L'' is also one-split, then we get components of types A and B similar to those appearing in Example 3.5. To summarize, assuming that the necessary splitting conjectures are true, $\mathbf{F}_k(X_{r,d})$ for $k=(r-2)(d-1)+1$ has the following irreducible components:

- **Type A**: d^r components of dimension
$$2((r-2)(d-1)+2)(d-2),$$
isomorphic in their reduced structures to a Grassmannian; general k-planes in such components are contained in the intersection of r coordinate hyperplanes.
- **Type B**: $\binom{r}{2}d^{r-2}\cdot(d!)$ components of dimension
$$(d-1)+((r-2)(d-1)+2)(d-2);$$
general k-planes in such components are contained in the intersection of $(r-2)$ coordinate hyperplanes.
- **Type C**: there are
$$\binom{r}{3}d^{r-3}\cdot 2\cdot\binom{d}{2}^3((d-2)!)^2$$
components of dimension $2d-1$; general k-planes in such components are contained in the intersection of $(r-3)$ coordinate hyperplanes.

- **Type D**: there are
$$\binom{r}{r-4,2,2} d^{r-4} \cdot (d!)^2$$
components of dimension $2(d-1)$; general k-planes in such components are contained in the intersection of $(r-4)$ coordinate hyperplanes.

This analysis relied on appropriate splitting statements, which (similar to Example 3.5) hold true if $r \leq 6$, $d = 4$, or $r \leq d+1$.

Example 3.8 ($\mathbf{F}_5(X_{4,3})$)**.** For a concrete example, consider $\mathbf{F}_5(X_{4,3})$. By Example 3.7, we see that this Fano scheme has the following components:

	Dimension	Number
Type A	12	81
Type B	8	324
Type C	5	648
Type D	4	216

.

4. Product Rank

4.1. **Bounding product rank.**

Proof of Theorem 1.7. For $rd \geq n+1$, assume that $\mathbf{pr}(f) \leq r$. This implies that there is a n-dimensional linear space $Y \subset \mathbb{P}^{rd-1}$ such that $V(f) = X_{r,d} \cap Y$. Since we are assuming that $V(f)$ is covered by k-planes, there must be a positive-dimensional subvariety $S \subset \mathbf{F}_k(X_{r,d})$ such that the k-planes corresponding to points in S are all contained in Y, and that the linear span of these k-planes is exactly Y.

Now, if all k-planes parametrized by S are contained in a coordinate hyperplane of $\mathbb{P}^{rd-1}$, we can clearly write f as a sum of $r-1$ products of linear forms, that is, $\mathbf{pr}(f) \neq r$. But this is certainly the case if $\mathbf{F}_k(X_{r,d})$ is one-split.

Assume instead that r is even and the two-splitting assumption of the theorem is fulfilled. As above, if every k-plane parametrized S is contained in a coordinated hyperplane, we are done. Otherwise, by the two-splitting assumption, we can permute the indices $i = 1, \ldots, r$ such that every k-plane L parametrized by S is contained in
$$V(x_{i1} \cdots x_{id} + x_{(i-1)1} \cdots x_{(i-1)d})$$
for $i = 2, 4, \ldots, r$. Using the notation from §3, this tells us that
$$y_{i1} \cdots y_{id} + y_{(i-1)1} \cdots y_{(i-1)d} = 0. \tag{11}$$
for $i = 2, 4, \ldots, r$. After reordering the y_{ij} for each fixed i, we conclude that for y_{ij} and $y_{(i-1)j}$ are proportional for $i = 2, 4, \ldots, r$ and $j \leq d$ for all k-planes L in S.

For some fixed $s = 2, 4, 6, \ldots, r$, suppose that the ratio $y_{sj}/y_{(s-1)j}$ is some constant c_j as L ranges over S. Note that these constants satisfy $\prod c_j = -1$. Then every L in S is contained in the linear space
$$V\left(\{x_{sj} - c_j x_{(s-1)j}\}_{j \leq d}\right)$$
so their span Y is as well. This means that after restricting to Y we have
$$\sum_{i=1}^{r} x_{i1} \cdots x_{id} = \sum_{i \neq s, s-1} x_{i1} \cdots x_{id}$$
so the product rank of f is at most $r-2$.

We have thus arrived in the situation where for each fixed $i = 2, 4, \ldots, r$, there is some $j \leq d$ such that the ratio between y_{ij} and $y_{(i-1)j}$ is non-constant over S. A straightforward calculation shows that the dimension of the span of two general k-planes L, L' in S must be at least $k + r$, leading to the inequality $k + r \leq n$; by assumption, this is a contradiction. □

Remark 4.1. Suppose that in the situation of part two of Theorem 1.7, we know that the family of k-planes $S \subset \mathbf{F}_k(V(f))$ covering $V(f)$ is m-dimensional. Then the hypothesis $k > n-r$ may be replaced with the condition $k > n-m-r/2$. Indeed, in the conclusion of the proof of the theorem, the assumption on the dimension of S guarantees that at least m of the ratios $y_{ij}/y_{(i-1)j}$ vary independently of each other. Combining Equation (11) with the fact that at least one ratio $y_{ij}/y_{(i-1)j}$ varies for each i guarantees that in fact a total of at least $m + r/2$ ratios vary. As above, this shows that the dimension of the span of two general k-planes L, L' in S must be at least $k + m + r/2$, leading to the desired contradiction.

4.2. **Examples of bounds on product rank.**

Example 4.2 (3×3 determinant)**.** In [IT16], Z. Teitler and the first author prove that $\mathbf{pr}(\det_3) > 4$, where $\det_3$ is the determinant of a generic 3×3 matrix. H. Derksen gave an expression for $\det_3$ as a sum of 5 multihomogeneous products of linear forms in [Der16], so we conclude $\mathbf{pr}(\det_3) = 5$. This also shows that the tensor rank of $\det_3$ equals five.

The proof that $\mathbf{pr}(\det_3)$ consisted of a computer calculation showing that $\mathbf{F}_5(X_{4,3})$ is 2-split, and then a special case of Theorem 1.7. Our Theorem 1.6 makes this computer calculation unnecessary.

Example 4.3 (4×4 determinant)**.** Let $\det_4$ be the 4×4 determinant. The projective hypersurface $V(\det_4)$ is covered by 11-dimensional linear spaces, see e.g. [CI15]. By Theorem 1.6, we know that $\mathbf{F}_{11}(X_{6,4})$ and $\mathbf{F}_7(X_{4,4})$ are both 2-split, so we may apply Theorem 1.7 to conclude that $\mathbf{pr}(\det_4) \neq 6$. A similar application of Theorem 1.7 shows that $\mathbf{pr}(\det_4) \neq 4, 5$. If $\mathbf{pr}(\det_4) \leq 3$, then the projective hypersurface $V(\det_4) \subset \mathbb{P}^{15}$ must be a cone, in which case every maximal linear subspace would contain a common line. But this is not the case, so we conclude that $\mathbf{pr}(\det_4) \geq 7$.

This is exactly the bound on product rank which follows from Z. Teitler and H. Derksen's bound on Waring rank. They show that the Waring rank of $\det_4$ is at least 50 [DT15], from which follows that $\mathbf{pr}(\det_4) \geq 7$ by [IT16, §1.2].

Our above argument for the product rank of $\det_4$ can be generalized to show that, for $n \geq 3$, $\mathbf{pr}(\det_n) \geq 2n - 1$, as long as we assume that Conjecture 1.3 holds. However, for $n \geq 5$ this is much worse than the bound that follows from known lower bounds on Waring rank [DT15].

Example 4.4 (6×6 Pfaffian)**.** Let f be the Pfaffian of a generic 6×6 skew-symmetric matrix. Derksen and Teitler show that the Waring rank of f is at least 24 [DT15]. Section 1.2 of [IT16] then implies that $\mathbf{pr}(f) \geq 6$.

We will use Theorem 1.7 to show that $\mathbf{pr}(f) \neq 6$, and hence $\mathbf{pr}(f) \geq 7$, a new lower bound. First note that by Theorem 1.6, $\mathbf{F}_9(X_{6,3})$ is one-split. Secondly, note that $V(f) \subset \mathbb{P}^{14}$ is covered by projective 9-planes. Indeed, for any 6×6 singular skew-symmetric matrix A with $0 \neq v \in \mathbb{K}^6$ in its kernel, consider the linear space of all 6×6 skew-symmetric matrices B satisfying

$$B \cdot v = 0.$$

This is clearly a linear space of singular skew-symmetric matrices containing A. There are six linear conditions cutting out this linear space, but they are linearly dependent, since

$$v^{\mathrm{tr}} \cdot A \cdot v = 0.$$

Hence, A is contained in a linear space of dimension $14-5 = 9$. The claim $\mathbf{pr}(f) \neq 6$ now follows from Theorem 1.7.

For our final example, we must use a different argument than Theorem 1.7, since the permanental hypersurface is not covered in high-dimensional linear spaces:

Example 4.5 (4×4 permanent)**.** Let perm_4 be the permanent of a generic 4×4 matrix. Shafiei has shown that the Waring rank of perm_4 is at least 35 [Sha15], from which follows that $\mathbf{pr}(\mathrm{perm}_4) \geq 5$ by [IT16, §1.2]. We will show that in fact, $\mathbf{pr}(\mathrm{perm}_4) \geq 6$. On the other hand, Glynn's formula gives 8 as an upper bound for the product rank of perm_4 [Gly10]. Note that our result also gives a lower bound of 6 on the *tensor rank* of perm_4.

To fix notation, suppose that perm_4 is the permanent of the matrix

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} z_{11} & z_{12} & z_{13} & z_{14} \\ z_{21} & z_{22} & z_{23} & z_{24} \\ z_{31} & z_{32} & z_{33} & z_{34} \\ z_{41} & z_{42} & z_{43} & z_{44} \end{pmatrix}.$$

The hypersurface $V(\mathrm{perm}_4) \subset \mathbb{P}^{15}$ contains exactly 8 11-planes [CI15]: H_i and V_j for $i, j \leq 4$ are given respectively by the vanishing of the ith row or jth column of M. Note that any two of the H_i, or any two of the V_j span the entire space $\mathbb{P}^{15}$.

If $\mathbf{pr}(\mathrm{perm}_4) \leq 5$, then $V(\mathrm{perm}_4)$ is isomorphic to $X_{5,4}$ intersected with a 15-dimensional linear space. If under the embedding of $V(\mathrm{perm}_4)$ in $X_{5,4}$, two of the H_i or two of the V_j are contained in a common coordinate hyperplane, it follows that $\mathbf{pr}(\mathrm{perm}_4) \leq 4$, contradicting the above bound. Thus, we may assume that this is not the case.

On the other hand, it follows from Theorem 1.6 that any 11-plane of $X_{5,4}$ is contained in the intersection of three coordinate hyperplanes. Since no pair of H_i or V_j is contained in a common coordinate hyperplane, some pair (H_a, V_b) must be contained in a common coordinate hyperplane. Now, H_a and V_b span the 14-dimensional linear space $L = V(z_{ab}) \subset \mathbb{P}^{15}$. But since this 14-dimensional linear space is contained in a coordinate hyperplane of $X_{5,4}$, we conclude that $\mathbf{pr}(\mathrm{perm}'_4) \leq 4$, where perm'_4 is obtained from perm_4 by setting $z_{ab} = 0$. We will show that this cannot be.

Indeed, in such a situation we would have $V(\mathrm{perm}'_4) \subset \mathbb{P}^{14}$ isomorphic to the intersection of $X_{4,4}$ with a 14-dimensional linear space. Intersecting H_i and V_j with L, we arrive at a set of 8 11- or 10-dimensional planes H'_i, V'_j with properties similar to above. Similar to above, if a pair of H'_i or V'_j is contained in a coordinate hyperplane in $X_{4,4}$, then we would have that $\mathbf{pr}(\mathrm{perm}'_4) \leq 3$. But if this is not the case, an argument similar to above shows that $\mathbf{pr}(\mathrm{perm}''_4) \leq 3$, where perm''_4 is obtained from perm_4 by setting two variables equal to zero. The key step of the argument is here another application of Theorem 1.6 showing that any 10-plane of $X_{4,4}$ is contained in four coordinate hyperplanes.

To arrive at the final contradiction, first note that $\mathbf{pr}(\mathrm{perm}'_4) \leq 3$ implies $\mathbf{pr}(\mathrm{perm}''_4) \leq 3$. The latter implies in particular that one can write perm''_4 as a form in 12 variables, that is $V(\mathrm{perm}''_4) \subset \mathbb{P}^{13}$ must be a cone. However, utilizing

the natural torus action on $V(\mathrm{perm}_4'')$ similar to in [CI15, Proposition 2.3], one easily verifies that the intersections of H_1, H_2, H_3, H_4 with this $\mathbb{P}^{13} \subset \mathbb{P}^{15}$ are all maximal linear subspaces of $V(\mathrm{perm}_4'')$. But their common intersection is empty, which contradicts $V(\mathrm{perm}_4'')$ being a cone. We conclude that $\mathbf{pr}(\mathrm{perm}_4'') > 3$, which in turn implies $\mathbf{pr}(\mathrm{perm}_4') > 4$, which finally implies $\mathbf{pr}(\mathrm{perm}_4) > 5$.

Acknowledgements. We thank Zach Teitler for helpful comments. The first author was partially supported by an NSERC Discovery Grant.

References

[AK77] Allen B. Altman and Steven L. Kleiman, *Foundations of the theory of Fano schemes*, Compositio Math. **34** (1977), no. 1, 3–47.

[Beh06] Roya Beheshti, *Lines on projective hypersurfaces*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **592** (2006), 1–21.

[BVdV79] W. Barth and A. Van de Ven, *Fano varieties of lines on hypersurfaces*, Arch. Math. (Basel) **31** (1978/79), no. 1, 96–104.

[CI15] Melody Chan and Nathan Ilten, *Fano schemes of determinants and permanents*, Algebra Number Theory **9** (2015), no. 3, 629–679.

[CLS11] David A. Cox, John B. Little, and Henry K. Schenck, *Toric varieties*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, vol. 124, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2011.

[Der16] Harm Derksen, *On the nuclear norm and the singular value decomposition of tensors*, Found. Comput. Math. **16** (2016), no. 3, 779–811.

[DT15] Harm Derksen and Zach Teitler, *Lower bound for ranks of invariant forms*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **219** (2015), no. 12, 5429–5441.

[GKZ08] I. M. Gelfand, M. M. Kapranov, and A. V. Zelevinsky, *Discriminants, resultants and multidimensional determinants*, Modern Birkhäuser Classics, Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2008, Reprint of the 1994 edition.

[Gly10] David G. Glynn, *The permanent of a square matrix*, European J. Combin. **31** (2010), no. 7, 1887–1891.

[Gua15] Yonghui Guan, *Flattenings and Koszul Young flattenings arising in complexity theory*, arXiv:1510.00886 [math.AG], 2015.

[Gua16] ———, *Equations for secant varieties of Chow varieties*, arXiv:1602.0247v2 [math.AG], 2016.

[HMP98] Joe Harris, Barry Mazur, and Rahul Pandharipande, *Hypersurfaces of low degree*, Duke Math. J. **95** (1998), no. 1, 125–160.

[IT16] Nathan Ilten and Zach Teitler, *Product rank of the* 3×3 *determinant and permanent*, Canad. Math. Bull. **59** (2016), 311–319.

[Lan97] Adrian Langer, *Fano schemes of linear spaces on hypersurfaces*, Manuscripta Math. **93** (1997), no. 1, 21–28.

[Sha15] Sepideh Masoumeh Shafiei, *Apolarity for determinants and permanents of generic matrices*, J. Commut. Algebra **7** (2015), no. 1, 89–123.

Department of Mathematics, Simon Fraser University, 8888 University Drive, Burnaby BC V5A1S6, Canada

E-mail address: nilten@sfu.ca

School of Mathematics, The University of Manchester Alan Turing Building, Oxford Road, Manchester M13 9PL, United Kingdom

E-mail address: hendrik.suess@manchester.ac.uk